Vol. X, No. 1 HUMAN EVENTS January 7, 1953

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA JAN 28 '53 LIBRARY

UN: THE TRAGIC FAILURE

By FELIX WITTMER

THE SMOKING OUT of Fifth Amendment Americans from the UN Secretariat is headline news; but it is hardly news to those of us who have watched the UN since its birth and recognized in its features a close resemblance to its Communist progenitors. We knew that it was a monster, destined to do us no good. Perhaps the current revelations will convince even our sentimentalists that it is time we got rid of it.

I cannot help recalling a scene at the local high school where the American Association for the United Nations staged one of its regular conferences. The President of the college where I taught, an inveterate booster, virtually compelled me to attend. I was supposed to speak, but I assigned three students in my place. With the candor and directness of youth, the students did a critical job on the UN and the Soviet Union, whose flag, among others, decorated the platform. The air was sick with dismay. But there was a sigh of relief when one of my colleagues, a Rhodes scholar, dramatically draped in his academic gown, in a trembling voice recited something about international brotherhood. Then the ladies of the community went into ecstasy as they intoned a Russian song.

And I remember a meeting at the State Department, a few months before the San Francisco conference. Leo Pasvolsky spoke with quiet and omniscient eloquence as the top-level shapers of our foreign policy — Stettinius, Clayton, Dunn, MacLeish, Nelson Rockefeller and a parcel of admirals and generals — listened to him with bated breath. Born in Pavlograd, Russia, Leo had come to the States in his childhood. He attended the College of the City of New York where he was reputed to have gone in for the radical causes. At the time the UN idea was a-borning, Pasvolsky had become the "gray eminence" in the State Department. Without Senatorial confirmation, he enjoyed a ranking equal to that of the Assistant Secretaries, and was tacitly accepted as the wizard who knew all the answers.

At the time of this meeting Pasvolsky had reportedly become critical of the Soviet Union, though it is not on record that he voiced any criticism of Communists. He tried rather to convince the audience, containing a number of lecturers, that Russia would be a power to be reckoned with, and that for reasons of "Realpolitik" we had better reconcile

U of M Bindery

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

1475455
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and adjust ourselves to this situation. In no way did he hint that a conspiracy was afoot or suggest ways of curbing Russia's drive for conquest.

Alger Hiss, the fair-haired boy of the State Department, sat smugly at the end of the speakers' table. He was publicly complimented by Pasvolsky as our expert on Dumbarton Oaks. It is now a matter of common knowledge that Hiss and Pasvolsky did the spade work for the San Francisco Conference.

Years later, after our myopic foreign policy had culminated in the debacle of Nationalist China, I heard Pasvolsky discuss our relations with Russia, at an annual conference of the American Political Science Association. He had by then switched over to the Brookings Institution and was no longer officially connected with the State Department. Did he in any way admit the foolishness of his quondam "Realpolitik"? Did he at least recommend any vigorous means of combating the Kremlin conspiracy? No, indeed. He was now emphasizing Russia's weakness as a "fait accompli" and warned against scaring her into war. I reminded him in the presence of some thirty scholars that his policies of the San Francisco days had lulled America into false hope. Naturally, he was peeved.

I cannot help thinking of the perhaps well-meaning but mistaken policy of Pasvolsky when I hear high school children of my state parrot the paeans on the UN they learned in class. More often than is wholesome, blandishment of Soviet achievements and criticism of our "reactionary" attitudes accompany this UN teaching. I know from personal experience how deeply such instruction has penetrated, for, for many years I visited these schools to observe the practice teachings of my college seniors.

United Nations World, which during 1952 still featured articles of such case-hardened apologists for Communist policy as Professor Frederic L. Schuman of Williams College, is still a favorite reference tool in our schools across the land. Not so long ago, Louis Dolivet was its editor. He was sought after as a speaker for our high school forums. Subsequently, he was denied re-entry to the United States, because of his Communist record. The influence of Dolivet was still present during the 1952 United Nations week when some 800 of my townsfolk rose to pay tribute to the strange flag which represents our merger with the atheistic traducers of our traditions. A mere 200 honored the Stars and Stripes on Flag Day.

WE SHOULD NOT be surprised that well-paid UN officials of American vintage refuse to state under oath whether or not they were or are members of the Communist Party. If they had no affinity for Communism what would they be doing in the UN? David Weintraub, UN Director of Economic Stability and Development, was quite refresh-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing when he said he "supposed it would not make any difference" if an UN employee were engaged in espionage. Indeed, the UN was designed for that very purpose.

The UN is the fulfillment of the world revolutionists' wildest dreams. Right in the heart of the largest city of the hated "capitalistic" nation, and mostly with that nation's money, the citadel of Marxism has been created; from it, protected by extra-territorial immunity, the conspiratorial rats emerge into the streets of New York to infect the populace. How nice!

The F. B. I. can at best spot only a few of them, if they are foreigners, and a Congressional investigating committee can only make things a little difficult for American traitors. But, the distribution of propaganda material, the transmission of orders from Moscow, the setting up of secret cells in our midst, the corruption of striking workers, the organization of sabotage squads for "The Day" cannot be prevented by our most vigilant efforts. For, as long as the UN exists, it will be the sheltered spawning ground of such activities.

Sanctimoniously preaching peace (which means peace under conditions laid down by Moscow), the smoothies from the skyscraper manage to promote United Nations Week in schools and churches. Their double-talk literature, with sly emphasis on the virtues of Communism, will continue to find space in our libraries and on the racks of our Y.M.C.A.'s. UN and World Federalist chapters will continue to spring up, with seeming spontaneity, on our campuses. Civic clubs will sponsor speakers from the United Nations Association. And in the summer, the colleges will continue to practice the ritual of the United Nations Institute and Workshop, to the great joy of the absurd females who flock to it.

SUPPOSE THE Secretariat throws out all the Weintraubs, Kaplans, Coes and Van Tassels. Who will replace them? Good Americans would hardly do. For the Communists in the other UN delegations — English, French, Scandinavian — would most certainly make it difficult for Americans on the staff who did not see eye to eye with them.

That other delegations to the UN are at least as infiltrated by Communists as our own follows from the basic premise of the organization: namely, that it is possible to get along with the Soviets on some basis of parity. Until Korea, that idea was prevalent in this country. There is no evidence that England has worked up an active opposition to Communism, and in France and other countries the Communist Party is a force to contend with. India has shown an appalling lenience to Communism.

As for the UN employees who hail from the U.S.S.R., the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland or Czechoslovakia — does anyone believe that they have any other business here than that of advancing the cause of world Communism? Or that, in the pursuit of that holy cause, they would hesitate to do espionage work?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is with such men and women that Americans on the Secretariat have to work. Vis-a-vis Communists, Americans are a minority on almost every committee. Hence, if by close screening and constant surveillance we were able to keep only patriotic Americans on the job, and assuming that they had the shrewdness always to detect the Communist "line", and the hardihood to oppose it, their effectiveness would still be nil.

When the Congressional investigating committee started after the American suspects on the Secretariat, the head of that body, Trygvie Lie, bleated something about "persecutions". He was quite in character. He is Secretary General only because he was acceptable to the Kremlin. I do not say he is a Communist; but he certainly could not be an anti-Communist and hold his job. It is on record, anyhow, that when he was the big wheel in Norway's Labor Party, Lie advocated affiliation with the Communist International. It was Lie who made trips to Moscow whenever the Kremlin wished to speak to his Labor Party.

In short, beginning with the head of it, the Secretariat of the UN is, to say the least, *en rapport* with Communism. If we clean out of it all the Americans who can be classified as Communists or fellow-travellers we will have done practically nothing to change the situation.

THE ONLY WAY IS to get out of the United Nations and get the United Nations out of the United States. We must begin by repudiating Yalta altogether. The grievous error of that event by now is apparent to anyone who can and wants to see. Is it good principle to follow a mistake to its logical end when that end is the destruction of all that our nation stands for, if not the nation itself?

The dishonor of our foreign policy is the logical sequence of the UN swindle. Gromyko staging a walk-out when the U.S.S.R., breaking another pledge, kept her troops in Iran. Vishinsky, the monster of the purge trials, constantly vituperating. Endless vetoes. The betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek. England sitting in the Council with Nationalist China while letting war supplies flow to the Communists through Hongkong. The idiocy of reporting to Russian agents in the UN the strategy of our "common police action" in Korea. Bickering about prisoners who do not wish to return to certain execution. What will the future bring?

There can never be any peace with men who have desecrated the human race, in the slave camps of Siberia, and by the genocide of Balts, Crimean Tartars, Volga Germans, Poles and Calmyks. We cannot negotiate with people who laugh at honor and, when we sit down to table with them, we debase our heritage of freedom.

Felix Wittmer, formerly on the faculty of State Teachers College in Montclair, N. J., has contributed to HUMAN EVENTS, *American Mercury* and the *Freeman.*

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5 50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume X, No. 1 Wednesday, January 7, 1953 Washington, D. C.

JAN 28 '53 LIBRARY

The Immigration Uproar: Behind the violent drive against the McCarran-Walter Immigration law, there lies (according to those Administration people willing to talk) a line-up of water-front racketeering interests and pro-Communist elements, financed by literally millions of dollars.

The water-front gangsters are largely Italian, and some are fighting to keep out of jail or to avoid deportation. The Anastasia organization — probably the real power force behind the nation's crime syndicate — is said to be spending a lot of money in the hope of amending the immigration bill. Immigration experts stress that every five years the Italian police try to clean up the Naples waterfront and that the resultant off-scouring penetrates our shores, often illegally. A considerable number of the Anastasia mob got in the U.S. by jumping ship. This channel can be stopped by strict enforcement of the McCarran law. (Hence the uproar in New York papers about the screening of foreign seamen before allowing them to take shore leave.)

Meanwhile, left-wingers are simultaneously working (whether in cooperation with the gangsters is not ascertainable) to discredit the McCarran-Walter law, for they also fear the screening procedure. Additionally, these elements aim to create as much racial friction as possible in the U.S. (a principal Commie objective). They exploit left-wing Jewish organizations against the law (although conservative Jewish organizations have shown no objection to the legislation). Finally, the White House collaborated with these leftists by setting up the Presidential commission which has just issued an adverse report on the McCarran statute.

A check is now being made of the persons called to testify against the law before this commission whose membership is heavily loaded with "liberals". So far, the check shows that about 30 per cent of the names of the witnesses appear also in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In Congress, the so-called liberals appear on the same side as the Anastasias — thus presenting the line-up of Communism and crime so often assailed by Republicans during the recent campaign. Hence it is not surprising that Senator Humphrey (Minnesota, Democrat) has taken a lead in fighting the McCarran law. Humphrey reportedly threatened to block insertion in the *Congressional Record* of the highly revelatory article in defense of the McCarran law which appeared in the *National Republic* magazine (noted in this column on December 24). But, friends of the immigration law, in order to avoid a fight about the insertion on the Senate floor with Humphrey, put the piece in the *Record* through the lower House of Congress.

Others have been active, distributing copies of the *National Republic* article in the state of Minnesota. This action may prove very troublesome for Senator Humphrey who will presumably run for re-election in that state in 1954. Republican Congressman Judd of that state, who voted for the McCarran law, is said to be planning to run for Senator against Humphrey. His stand on the McCarran law will not lose him votes among the farmers of Minnesota.

Churchill's Real Mission: What the British Prime Minister is up to here offers a topic of intense discussion in the Capital during the past 48 hours. Originally, when the visit to our shores was first announced, attention was focused on the British desire for a "stabilization loan". Opinion here in the past

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few days has veered, some saying that financial help occupies second place on Churchill's agenda. The position of the pound sterling has somewhat improved and the Conservative Government commands stronger popular support in recent months. What, then, is the primary objective?

Since Churchill's arrival here, it has been frequently reported that the British leader aspires to the role of re-designing world political and military strategy against the Kremlin. History has shown that Churchill fancies himself as even better at military than political strategy.

Therefore, there has emerged — in private discussion among observers here — the daring speculation that Churchill will propose to Ike a global military strategy very similar to that advanced by former President Hoover, by Taft and by MacArthur — known loosely as the "sea-air" strategy.

The reasons adduced in support of this surprising claim are as follows:

(1) Britain will not commit troops to the NATO mass ground force on the continent. Naturally, the British perceive that NATO is fast becoming a corpse, due to the French attitude toward German re-armament. The British staff apparently recognizes that Russia has now air superiority over the Continent and could use the atom bomb on ports and rail centers to cripple any NATO army.

(2) The private conversation of British officers since last summer has shown a change — a strong insistence on the importance of air power and strategic bombing. Since they obviously do not intend to place any large ground forces on the Continent, the British military leaders apparently feel that the only way to challenge Stalin's threat to the Continent is through Allied air superiority.

All this adds up to the presumption that Churchill will try to shape Ike's ideas on world strategy along lines orginally advanced by former President Hoover. Churchill conceivably might "sell" Ike. It is not forgotten that toward the end of the political campaign last October Ike talked of military strategy in terms closely resembling those of Hoover. And it is also recalled that Hoover laid much stress, in his military plan, on the desirability of British-American cooperation in the "sea-air" defense concept.

The Citizen Asks: Our replies to some very frequent questions of today:

(1) *Isn't it dangerous to fill the new Administration with big businessmen?* Yes — but not for the reasons usually given. There is no danger of big businessmen in Government grinding the faces of the poor and exalting the rich (as often alleged). There is danger, however, that members of this politically naive class might be hoodwinked into supporting "liberal" and "me-too" measures.

Who will do the hoodwinking? The bureaucracy without whom a businessman holding a cabinet position cannot operate. We never tire of repeating that it is the "middle bureacrats" who run the show — they get the information, slant it, send it with their recommendations upstairs. "Upstairs", even if he's a member of the Union League Club, will take this policy and issue it as his own. The process is so subtle that few of these business figures ever realize exactly what happened to them.

(2) *Should Taft carry out the legislative program of General Eisenhower?* We don't know exactly what Ike's legislative program will be. But, human nature being what it is, there are bound to be differences between the leader of the upper house of the Legislative branch and the head of the Executive branch. We hope they will compose their differences on an equal basis. If they do not, we hope they will amicably agree to disagree. As we read the Constitution, the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government are separate and co-equal. It would seem to us as presumptuous to assume submissiveness on the part of the Legislative branch as to expect that the third branch, the Supreme Court, would uphold any law Eisenhower wants passed, including new ones recreating the NRA and AAA, or to disapprove any law the new Executive did not like.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) *Will the new Administration get on with labor?* If this question be altered to read "the labor union bosses", we would say: unfortunately, there's danger that it will. The Durkin appointment was a symptom. Not only the "liberals" in the Executive but also the head of the House Labor committee, Congressman McConnell — who reportedly "me-too's" the labor bosses — could arrange matters to favor the latter. So, at least, observers of labor legislation fear. As we reported last summer, a legislative fight for retention of the Taft-Hartley labor law and against repeal would be easier than a complicated fight over amendments to the law. The outlook on labor legislation is far from clear.

(4) *Is there danger that President Eisenhower, a military man, will rush us into a world war?* No — at least not because he is a military man: quite the contrary. All generals are potential McClellans; they want to have twice as many men and twice as much materiel as the enemy before they fight. The real danger of rushing us into all-out war comes from the politicos, not the military men. To the extent that Eisenhower takes on the character of a politician and sloughs off his military inclinations, there will be danger.

Coudert Amendment: It is known that Senator Taft intends to offer legislation for reform of the so-called electoral college. Whether he favors the Coudert Amendment (described in HUMAN EVENTS, in our issue of December 10), is not known. He would certainly like the Coudert Amendment in so far as it reduces the political power of New York. But he reportedly wants to study the Coudert proposal to see how much or how little it favors the GOP. Meanwhile, the Coudert Amendment has been given the title, "HJ 1" — House Joint Resolution No. 1. It has drawn a good press; among those favoring it is Mr. Arthur Krock, head of the Washington bureau of the *New York Times*.

Tax Front: In Massachusetts — the state of that famous individualist, Henry Thoreau — there has appeared another tax rebel, one Mrs. Lucy Sisson, proprietor of a candy shop in South Middleboro. Mrs. Sisson refuses to pay the Social Security tax as a "self-employed" person, in the amount of $15.80. She bases her refusals on the ground that compulsory insurance is unconstitutional. Boston papers on December 5 ran photos of Mrs. Sisson posting a sign in her shop window which reads, "Lost, Strayed or Stolen — The Constitution of the United States". The Department of Internal Revenue has been disputing with Mrs. Sisson and last fall a warrant for distraint in the amount of $15.80 was issued. But, no action has been reported up to date so far as we know.

The Sisson case recalls the fight of courageous Miss Vivien Kellems of Connecticut, manufacturer, who refused to pay the withholding tax for her employees; and also the case of the housewives of Marshall, Texas, who refused to pay withholding for their domestic servants. In these cases, the attitude of the Bureau was marked by a strong disinclination to come to a legal showdown with the persons involved, and so the constitutional issue was avoided in the courts.

A Book Event: In July, 1936, Harpers published an excellent little book on economics that achieved best-seller status. Six printings followed, and in 1948 a "pocket book" edition appeared. The demand continued and after sixteen years many still want *Economics in One Lesson*, by Henry Hazlitt. So, the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y., is making it available at the sensible price of three copies for one dollar. It is a sensible price because it induces the purchaser to send the extra two copies to college students, to act as an antidote to the kind of instruction in economics they are probably receiving from their teachers.

Bound and Ready: In a few weeks, bound copies of HUMAN EVENTS for 1952 — Volume IX — will be ready for distribution. The price is $4.00 per copy. Last year we did not have enough copies to fill our orders. Those who wish copies are urged to place their orders immediately.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I Dreamt Revolution: by William Reswick. Chicago. Henry Regnery Company. $4.50. Reviewed by William Henry Chamberlin.

When Lenin died after months of paralyzed helplessness, in January, 1924, the Politburo — highest executive organ of the Communist Party — was composed of seven members. Their names were Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin and Tomsky. Call this roll today and the response is one all-powerful dictator and six obituary notices. Stalin is nothing if not thorough. He had done to violent death, along with millions of his own subjects and large numbers of people outside the Soviet frontiers, every one of his six former associates, Lenin's most trusted lieutenants.

Stalin did not assume full measure of his present power immediately after the death of Lenin. Several years of tortuous inner party intrigue, masked as far as possible from the ordinary Soviet citizen and from the outside world, were to pass before the Machiavellian son of an alcoholic Caucasian cobbler felt able to drop his humble pose as merely a spokesman for the will of the Party and step out in a full blaze of dictatorial glory.

Now we have a vivid description of this period (1924-1930) by a Russian-born American newspaperman who worked for two of the larger news agencies, AP and INS, in Moscow. Because of his fluent Russian, Reswick was able to establish contacts with Russians which would be unthinkable for a foreign journalist today and which were unusual even in the much milder twenties. Among the prominent figures with whom he recounts interviews are Alexis I. Rykov, Prime Minister after Lenin's death, first deposed and later shot by Stalin; Nikolai Bukharin, leading theoretician, who suffered a similar fate; Yagoda, who later became head of the terrorist police; and the cosmopolitan journalist and pamphleteer, Karl Radek.

Rykov and Bukharin, along with the Soviet trade-union leader, Tomsky, were the leaders of the right wing of the Communist Party and Reswick's book is both a tribute to their memory and a story of how they failed to cope with the wiles of the cunning and brutal Stalin. Stalin's most dangerous period was in 1929 and 1930, when his drive for industrialization and collectivization of agriculture had made the cities hungry and turned the peasant villages into angry hornets' nests.

Then was the opportunity for the "Rights". A military coup d'etat which would have liquidated Stalin and his henchmen would have been greeted enthusiastically by ninety per cent of the Soviet population. But there was no one among these relatively moderate Communists strong enough to organize such a coup. They were bound by the fetish of preserving Party unity and did not realize, until too late, that this had become merely an instrument in Stalin's hands for erecting a personal dictatorship far more ruthless and absolute than that of any Tsar.

Reswick watched this struggle, which also included the elimination of Trotsky from political life, from a journalistic box seat, as a result of his Soviet contacts and his knowledge of Russian. He brings to life all the big stories covered by newspapermen who were in Moscow at that time: the mourning for Lenin in a week of thirty below zero temperature; the expectation of the Trotskyist military stroke that never came; the fizzle of the Trotskyist demonstration on the tenth anniversary of the Revolution; the sending of Trotsky into exile.

There is also a more personal side of the book: the author's boyhood in a Russian-Ukrainian-Jewish town; his flight between dusk and dawn after he had, according to his account, committed aggravated contempt of court; his return to Russia and work as a relief administrator after years of immigrant adjustment and knocking about in America. His book is a historical memoir of value and a readable newspaperman's story of reporting from a Russia on which the iron curtain had not completely clanged down.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED